

REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action dated September 11, 2006, has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

I. OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application. On pages 2-7 of the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Freeman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0059137, hereinafter “Freeman”) in view of Tengel (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,812, hereinafter “Tengel”), further in view of Broadbent et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0197953, hereinafter “Broadbent”). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

As stated in MPEP § 2143, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant’s disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Also, as stated in MPEP § 2143.01, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Further, as stated in MPEP § 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). That is, “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

A. The September 11, 2006, Office Action fails to address all claim recitations

At the outset, Applicant respectfully points out that the September 16, 2006, office action fails to address all recitations of the pending claims. For example, the office action addresses the recitation “receiving mortgage approval application data from an end user device, wherein the mortgage approval application data is entered into the end user device by a borrower,” but fails to address any of the other recitations of the pending claims. Therefore, for purposes of this response Applicant assumes that the other recitations are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the office action dated December 19, 2005. Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned if this assumption is incorrect.

B. Freeman, Tengel & Broadbent fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations

Regarding claims 1-20, the Examiner asserts in the December 19, 2005, office action that Freeman discloses forwarding the mortgage approval application to a plurality of mortgage underwriting systems, wherein each mortgage underwriting system receives at least one of the plurality of mortgage approval applications (p.2: 16, 21; p.3: 38; and p.5: 57); receiving at least

one decision from the at least one decision based on the mortgage approval application (p.6: 58); forwarding the at least one decision to the borrower device (p.6: 58)” as recited in independent claims 1 and 10. *See* Office Action at p. 2-3. The Examiner also asserts that Freeman further discloses “forwarding the at least one decision to the borrower device, wherein the at least one decision comprises at least one universal approval, designation of at least on mortgage loan program, the terms and conditions of the designated at least one mortgage program, and an indication of the best fit mortgage loan program for the borrow (p.6: 60 and p.7: 73-74)” as recited in independent claims 19 and 20. *See* 12/19/05 Office Action at p. 3-4.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Broadbent remedies the deficiencies in Freeman by disclosing “a method and corresponding system for mortgage loans comprising creating a plurality of mortgage approval applications comprising the mortgage approval application data (p.5, 60-69).”

In the September 11, 2006, office action, the Examiner asserts that “Freeman does not disclose the mortgage application approval data entered into the end user device by a borrower.” However, the Examiner asserts that “Tengel teaches a method and corresponding system for on-line mortgage approval comprising the mortgage application approval data entered into the end user device by a borrower (col. 8, line 20 to col. 9, line 30). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the mortgage application approval data entered into the end user device by a borrower, as taught into the invention disclosed by Freeman, to allow the user the alternative method of electronically filling in applications to simplify the application process.” *See* 9/11/06 Office Action at p. 2

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Freeman, Tengel nor Broadbent, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests any feature or functionality comprising an application creating module for **“creating a plurality of mortgage approval applications comprising the mortgage approval application data”** as expressly recited in independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 20 (emphasis added), and further teaching or suggesting that **“wherein the application creating module creates the plurality of mortgage approval applications without intervention from the borrower”** as expressly recited in claim 1, 10, 19 and 20 (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that Freeman, as acknowledged by the Examiner, fails to teach or suggest, **“creating a plurality of mortgage approval applications comprising the mortgage approval application data”** as recited in claims 1, 19, and 20 and **“wherein the application creating module creates the plurality of mortgage approval applications without intervention from the borrower”** as further recited in claim 10. See 12/19/05 Office Action at p. 5.

Not only does Freeman fail to disclose **creating** mortgage applications, the reference fails to disclose creating **a plurality** of mortgage approval applications. For example, Freeman merely discloses – as evidenced by an excerpt in the reference – populating a **single** application with the application data entered:

When a loan application or other related data has been entered, either by importing it or keying the data, the present system uses the data to populate all fields in all parts of **a mortgage loan application** file employing hypertext markup language (HTML). If there are errors in the data, a message will be sent to the user. Otherwise, the originator will see the data displayed on the web site for confirmation as soon as it is entered. The originator can change information directly on the web page and then save the data (via EDIT APPLICATION) when satisfied that the data are correct.

See Freeman at ¶ 54. (emphasis added). Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that Freeman discloses creating a plurality of mortgage applications, Applicant respectfully submits that Freeman does not disclose the application creating module creates the plurality of mortgage approval applications without intervention from the borrower as expressly recited in the claim. Here, the Examiner's interpretation of Freeman does not work because it requires user intervention (e.g., the user creating the plurality of applications). Thus, Applicant submits that Freeman does not teach or suggest "creating a plurality of mortgage approval applications comprising the mortgage approval application data, wherein the application creating module creates the plurality of mortgage approval applications without intervention from the borrower."

Applicant respectfully submits that Broadbent fails to remedy the deficiencies in Freeman. Broadbent, for example, discloses a mortgage loan originator compliance engine but fails to teach or suggest "creating a plurality of mortgage approval applications comprising the mortgage approval application data, wherein the application creating module creates the plurality of mortgage approval applications without intervention from the borrower." Rather, Broadbent discloses – as evidenced by an excerpt of the reference – that the borrower and the loan originator work together throughout the loan origination process:

In an embodiment of the System, the Borrower and Loan Originator work together throughout the loan origination process. Once a Borrower decides to work with a Loan Originator on the System, the System will have the Borrower and Loan Originator answer typical financial and property questions concerning the Borrower. The answers to these questions will allow the System to pre-qualify the Borrower for a loan and offer appropriate loan program options to the Borrower. Once the System makes this information available to the Borrower and Loan Originator, the Borrower will be able to choose to make a formal mortgage loan application on-line through the Loan Originator.

See Broadbent at ¶ 58. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Broadbent does not teach or suggest “creating a plurality of mortgage approval applications comprising the mortgage approval application data, wherein the application creating module creates the plurality of mortgage approval applications without intervention from the borrower.”

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Freeman, Tengel nor Broadbent teach or suggest -- alone or in combination -- any of the other features and functionalities expressly recited in the independent claims.

For example, the Examiner further states that Freeman discloses “a transmitter forwarding device for forwarding the at least one decision to the borrower device (p. 6 : 58).” Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Freeman merely teaches that the “status of the loan on the detail page changes when the underwriting report comes back.” Moreover, Applicant submits that any loan status provided by Freeman is sent to the *originator*, **not** to the *borrower* device, as required by the pending claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Freeman does not teach or suggest a transmitter forwarding device for forwarding the at least one decision to the borrower device.

Applicant also submits that Broadbent does not disclose a forwarding module for “forwarding the plurality of mortgage approval applications to a plurality of underwriting systems, wherein each mortgage underwriting system receives at least one of the plurality of mortgage approval applications” as expressly recited in independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 20. In contrast, Broadbent discloses – as evidenced by an excerpt in the reference – that the borrower and the originator *select one mortgage application to be forwarded to one underwriting system*:

After a consultation between the Borrower and Loan Originator, the Borrower will then be able to *select a loan program* -or request the System to find the most advantageous interest rate available from the

various lender options. The System and staff will select a loan product and submit the application to the appropriate lender for approval and distribute on-line results back to the Borrower and Loan Originator, together with a complete set of underwriting conditions...

See Broadbent at ¶ 59. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Broadbent does not disclose a forwarding module for “forwarding the plurality of mortgage approval applications to a plurality of underwriting systems, wherein each mortgage underwriting system receives at least one of the plurality of mortgage approval applications.”

C. Lack of motivation to combine Freeman, Tengel and Broadbent

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not present a proper motivation to combine the references to achieve the claimed systems and method, and thus has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the allegation that one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified Freeman “to allow the user the alternative method of electronically filling in applications” is unfounded in the teachings of either Freeman or Tengel. Applicants respectfully submit that such an alleged motivation is improperly based on hindsight from viewing the pending claims. Furthermore, Freeman makes no suggestion that it would benefit from or seeks to permit alternative methods for electronically filling in applications, while Tengel fails to offer any suggestion that it would improve on or enhance Freeman’s systems and methods for allowing a *mortgage originator* to process a loan application online. Broadbent also fails to make any of these suggestions. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Freeman, Tengel and Broadbent is improper.

D. Dependent claims

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 are dependent upon independent claim 1 or 10. Thus, since independent claims 1 and 10 should be allowable for the reasons discussed above, claims 2-9 and

11-18 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1 or 10. Moreover, these claims recite additional features which are not claimed, disclosed, or even suggested by the cited references taken either alone or in combination. For example, Freeman does not teach or suggest the steps of presenting a questionnaire to the individual, wherein the mortgage approval application data received is generated at the end user device in response to the questionnaire, as recited in dependent claim 8 and 17. As stated above, Freeman discloses systems and methods that involve interaction with a mortgage originator, not the individual borrower. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Freeman does not disclose presenting a questionnaire to the individual as required by claim 8 and 17.

The Examiner further acknowledges in the Office Action that “Freeman does not disclose...the mortgage approval application decision further comprises a universal non-limited mortgage approval...wherein the individual selects at least one of the group of: a) the terms and conditions from a predetermined underwriting system; b) a link for connecting the at least one mortgage approval application decision to an appropriate lender, and c) a link for accessing an appropriate lenders website” as recited in dependent claims 4-7 and 13-16. *See* 12/19/05 Office Action at p. 5-6. Neither Tengel nor Broadbent discloses any of these features and/or functionalities and therefore the references also do not make up Freeman’s deficiencies in this regard.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned obviousness rejection of claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The


Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams LLP

By:


Ozzie A. Farres
Registration No. 43,606

Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
Telephone: (202) 955-1500
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201
Date: February 12, 2007